INFORMATION TRANSFER STANDARDS MANAGEMENT
PANEL (IXMP)
MEETING MINUTES

1. Introduction. The Information Transfer Management Panel (IXMP) Chairman, Mr. Louis Pilla from Joint Interoperability and Engineering Organization's (JIEO's) Center for Standards (CFS), convened the eighth (8^{th}) meeting of the IXMP on 11 Mar 99 at 0830 hours. The meeting was held at LOGICON's facility in Eatontown, NJ.

2. Opening Remarks. Mr. Pilla welcomed all attendees. He expressed his pleasure with such large attendance for this meeting. He stated that the main purpose of the IXMP was to develop, maintain and manage DOD telecommunication standards, other than the SATCOM standards that fall under the SISC. He noted that it has been a long time between meetings and because of that we have a very full agenda today. He asked all participants introduce themselves (Attachment A).

3. Approval of Meeting Agenda. Mr. Gerald Ring, JIEO/CFS, IXMP Secretariat, after providing some general comments on the meeting facilities, asked if there were any additions or corrections to the meeting Agenda. There were none and the Agenda was approved as presented (Attachment B).

4. Approval of Last Meeting Minutes. Mr. Ring asked for corrections and/or additions to the minutes of the last IXMP Meeting (8 Apr 98). There were no comments, therefore, the minutes were approved as written and published.

5. Defense Standardization Program. Mr. Andrew Certo, OSD, Deputy Director of the Defense Standardization Program Office (DSPO) briefed this item to the IXMP. He described the organization and stated that their office falls under the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. He stated that there is a Defense Standardization Council (DSC) which sets DSP policy and direction and is changing its emphasis's to standardization rather than standards. He then suggested that anyone is developing a standard then its focus should be on "what" you want rather than the "how to" develop to meet the requirements. He stated that the Perry Memo (29 Jun 94) was sometimes misunderstood. The intent of the Perry Memo was to justify the use of standards. The

standards reform goals are to save money and remove the barriers to integrate the military/commercial standards, which should enable DOD to access state-of-the-art technology.

Mr. Certo talked to the progress vs the goals for standards reform stating that reform actions have made a lot of progress in the government arena but still have a long way to go in the area involving non government standards. The future is that standards reform is winding down. He noted that there is computer based training (using CD ROM technology) available to provide guidance on when to standardize.

There is a new revision to DOD 4120.3 M in process. This revision is intended to be an administrative revision to incorporate numerous policy memos. This is still being coordinated. Approval is expected this summer. The Chairman asked if SE approval will still be needed to create a “new” standard. Mr. Certo replied that he believes that requirement will be one of the Polices incorporated into the 4120.3 revision. The Chairman stated that was a good policy. If approval authority was at the SISC or the IXMP level, and since DISA chairs both groups, then DISA could be in seen to be in a position of holding up the USAF or the USA from creating a standard they need.

Mr. Certo noted that Strategic Standardization Plan is being developed which is driven by the “new” defense environment. The plan is to transition DOD out of being the technology leader and instead let commercial industry be the technology leader. The new philosophy is to rely on commercial standards and commercial designs. In the past DOD has focused on the standardization of nuts, bolts and piece parts, rather than the standardization of systems. As an example, Mr. Certo stated that the new Joint Strike Fighter provides 80% commonality. This is a new approach to supporting the warfighter. One way that the DSC will make this move is to have Lead Standardization Activities (LSAs) appointed by the DSC rather than by the services. This will result in planned and higher level standardization.

In closing Mr. Certo stated that the vision for 2010 is coalition warfare with joint forces. We want information superiority, and to get it we will upgrade or insert new technology, through spares rather than upgrading through

new equipment. One of the lessons learned is that the DOD still needs standardization of safety, human factors and reliability.

6. Combat Net Radio (CNR) Implementers Working Group.
Mr. Conroy Smith, ARINC, briefed this item in the absence of Mr. Ed Robinson, CECOM, CNR Working Group (WG) Chairman. Mr. Conroy gave an overview of the WG, which meets bi-monthly, and that the two (2) standards involved in CNR are MIL-STD-188-220B and MIL-STD-2045-47001B. The main purposes of the group are to fix incomplete aspects of the standards, resolve implementation issues with joint approval and coordinate with joint and/or commercial standards bodies.

Mr. Conroy explained the change process used by the WG. He stated that new items have been introduced but not yet accepted by the WG for action. If the proposed item was accepted by the WG for action then it became a Work Item (WI). Then the implementers discuss and agree on a common interpretation of an existing standard. The change is then drafted as changes to the applicable military standard. When the WG gives conditional approval (i.e. approved with contingencies) or final approval, the change is forwarded to the IXMP for processing.

The members of the CNR WG are the USA, USN, USMC and the USAF. However, the USAF does not use the radio and therefore does not generally participate in the WG meetings. Some of the active participants in the WG are: USMC's DACT program, USN's FA-18 program, USA's SEC, PM FBCB2, PM FATDS, PM SINGARS, PM CHS, PM Land Warrior and some contractors.

MIL-STD-188-220 is the Interoperability Standard for Digital Message Transfer Device Subsystems. It was updated to a "B" Revision in Jan, 98. He Noted that the approved changes to the OSI Layer 2 Protocol (RCP Segment Count Field, Transmission Word Count (TWC) Calculation, DAP-NAD Equations 1 & 2 and several pending changes) are being reviewed by the WG as a "C" revision of -220. Mr. Conroy noted that some of the implementers of this standard which are: USMC's DACT Program, USN's FA-18 and USA's INC, IDM and the TCIM Programs.

MIL-STD-2045-47001 is the Interoperability Standard for Connectionless Data Transfer Application Layer Standard.

It was updated to a “B” Revision in Jan, 98. Again there are approved changes to the OSI Layer 7 (Construction of VMF MSG Data, Data Compression Type, Message Size Field and Registered Port Number 1581) that are being reviewed for possible impact on the military standard. Some implementers of this standard are Navy’s FA-18, USMC’s DACT Program and Army’s FBCB2, ABCS, EBC, IDM and Land Warrior Programs.

Mr. Conroy said that major issues with the WG are: Annual publication of new versions of the military standards; Resolution of significant disputes; and certification testing. In conclusion, Mr. Conroy felt that the CNR WG is active and effective in exercising configuration management of the standards and facilitating interoperability between implementers.

7. Status Report for MIL-STD-188-241. Mr. Doug Antisell, CECOM/PM TRCS, briefed this item to the IXMP. He gave the background of the standard. And stated that there was a Working Draft of the standard in Jun, 92 and an approved Coordination Draft in Jul, 95. Since that time the WG has been working on improving the standard.

The current plans are for the WG to address the extra hops issue and finalize the draft in Mar, 99. Another SD-1 Coordination Draft will be distributed in May, 99 and release for publication is scheduled for Jun, 99. Within this same time frame a revision to the standard is planned. This revision will incorporate into the standard the SIP and the ASIP waveforms. That revision should be ready for SD-1 Coordination in Aug, 99 and released for publication in Sep, 99.

The Chairman stated that he did not want to see two SD-1 distributions of this standard in a two to three month period. He suggested that Mr. Antisell combine the two distributions to eliminate confusion on the part of all the personnel who review the document during a formal SD-1 distribution. He further suggested that the projected schedule was very tight and wanted to know if the services have reviewed the standard and the proposed changes. Mr. Antisell responded the he was not sure if the services had reviewed the standard or the proposed changes. The Chairman directed that the services be called into the WG meeting and that Mr. Antisell should get their approval prior to SD-1 distribution (Action Item 8-1).

8. Working Group on Security. Mr. Elmer McDowell, IECA, briefed this item in place of the WG Chairman, Mr. Paul Wisniewski, NSA. He noted that the WG began in May, 97 and are held approximately three (3) times a year. The meetings were usually held in Columbia, MD at Sparta Inc. The WG participants are the USAF, DISA, NSA, Sparta and IECA. There are two (2) projects within the WG; Security Labeling Options Protocol and Message Security Standardization.

The Security Labeling standard, MIL-STD-2045-48501, has been published. NATO has reorganized so that the AHWG on security now falls under Sub-group 9 and this now causes the NATO work to be divided into two (2) parts. The US part is the labeling standard and the French have responsibility for mediation and national boundaries part.

The Messaging Security Standardization work of the Group requires a long-term solution. The interim solution is a Security Annex to STANAG 4406. The primary standard for messaging security is ACP 120 and that has been recently ratified. The Chairman asked Mr. McDowell about the lack of participation by the Army or the Marines in the WG, but Mr. McDowell had no answer.

9. High Frequency Standards. Dr. Eric Johnson, New Mexico State University, briefed the group on HF ALE. He began by stating that MIL-STD-188-141B and -187-721B along with the MODEM standard (-188-110B) make up a fairly complete HF radio automation package. MIL-STD-188-141B brought in what was formally experimental technology, and the Automatic Link Establishment (ALE) added a requirement to detect other users on the channel. This has resulted in significantly higher performance. He noted that –188-141B has requirements added for e-mail capabilities. Dr. Johnson noted that the standards have gone through SD-1 coordination and a coordination meeting has been held. He is waiting for approval from the WG. Mr. Ring stated that once the WG has approved the standards, he needs a hard copy and soft copy of the standards so they can be supplied to the DODSSP in Philadelphia in order to be published and distributed.

Dr. Johnson discussed testing and implementation status. The ALE has not been implemented in real hardware but the technologies that led to the ALE have. Key portions of the ALE have been simulated in NETSIM and OPNET and performed

as expected. One of the key metrics on how well a HF system performs is the speed with which it takes to get your link. The new method is faster, and uses less overhead time on the channels.

Dr. Johnson was questioned as to when this standard would be implemented on a program. At present there were no customers, but the standard is backward compatible, and it is expected that it will be just a matter of time.

The Chairman noted that the Army should take the necessary action to see that the updated revisions of these two (2) standards are placed in the JTA (Action Item (AI) 8-2).

10. MELP Speech Coding. Mr. John Collura, NSA, Chairman of the NATO AHWP for Narrow Band Voice Coding, addressed the group. He noted that MELP Speech coding is an enabling technology suite for seamless interoperability on narrow band voice systems. The goal for his group is to develop an interoperable voice standard. This standard has been started, the main body is complete, and the remainder of the standard should be completed within the next two months. It will then be submitted to the IXMP for approval.

The Legacy Systems 1 involved in MELP are the ANDVT, SINGARS, STU-II & STU-III, JTIDS and Link-11 (which is planned for use until 2015 or longer because five (5) nations are using it). Legacy Systems II, has three (3) speech coding algorithms; 2.4Kbps LPC10e, 4.8Kbps CELP and 16Kbps CVSD which are gap fillers until the MELP technology is installed. MELP is the future Narrow Band Digital Terminal (FNBDT). The Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) Joint Program Office (JPO) is sponsoring NSA to develop a 1.2Kbps MELP radio which will reduce the transmission power by one-half (½) but maintain the same range.

Mr. Collura stated that DOD spent $5 Million to develop both 1.2 & 2.4Kbps MELP algorithms. These algorithms have been tested and work rather well. And therefore, the development of the hardware to implement these algorithms should start this summer. The quality of the speech enhancements has been greatly improved. The MELP technology should provide seamless global interoperability and end-to-end security for both the US and NATO. MELP coding should be selected as the international standard for allied interoperability.

11. MIL-STD-188-110B. Mr. Gregg Noud, USAF/AFCA, WG Chairman, addressed this MODEM standard for the Panel. He stated that the USAF is the Preparing Activity (PA) for –110B. The USN, USA, DISA, NSA and Joint Staff (JS) are participating in the review cycle. He has also included Dr. Andrew Gillespie of UK's DERA as a member of the WG because of his expertise on STANAG 5066. There are many standards that are combined or mixed together that make up a complete HF system. Some of these standards are FED STD 1052, STANAG 5066, STANAG 4415, Narrow Band Shift and MIL-STD-188-141B. The future of MIL-STD-188-110B is that two (2) Change Notices (CN) are to be written to remove the text of the STANAGs and reference them instead. Mr. Noud proposed that the standard should by completed by Jan, 2000.

12. STANAG 5066 Report. Mr. Andrew Gillespie, UK/DERA, briefed this item to the IXMP. He noted that STANAG 5066 is the Profile for HF Radio Data Communications. The original goal was to provide an efficient, non-proprietary data link protocol specifically designed for use with off-the-shelf HF modems. This STANAG was initially developed for NATO's Broadcast and Ship to Shore Program (BRASS). DERA and the Shape Technical Center (now the NATO C3 Agency (NC3A)) was to develop the STANAG. The boundaries of the STANAG were that it had to be non-proprietary, cost-effective to implement, supports a variety of existing modems and be tested to reduce risk.

Marconi Communications developed the current prototype software and Rockwell Collins has developed second sets of programs. They feature PC-based software based on Windows NT/95, with a simple messaging client for ACP 127 style applications, e-mail with automatic SMTP/HMPT conversion and a file transfer capability. This software was delivered on floppy disks. It supports off-the-shelf modems such as Harris 5710, Marconi ARM 9401 and Rockwell MDM 3001.

Mr. Gillispie showed the STANAG client/server architecture. He also discussed testing. He stated that there has been lab testing and live testing with the Royal Navy (RN). He also mentioned that the STANAG was tested to FED-STD-1052. The file transfer testing also proved that file transfers could be carried out at different data rates.

The current interest in 5066 is that 11 nations have officially stated that they will implement 5066 for the NATO BRASS program. Some key points to provide interoperability between the US standards and NATO STANAGs is to standardize using STANAG 5066 Annex A, STANAG 4539, and MIL-STD-110B. Then refine the interface between STANAG 5066 and MIL-STD-188-141A. The next step would be to provide interoperability between STANAGs 4538/4539 and MIL-STD-110B in asynchronous mode. Future systems must provide compatibility between STANAG 4538 and MIL-STD-188-141. In conclusion, STANAG 5066 has been supported by testing and will be implemented under the NATO BRASS program.

13. Product Improvement Forms (PIF). Mr. Ring stated that there were no Product Improvement Forms (PIFs) submitted for this IXMP to review/approve: there was no action on this item for this IXMP meeting.

14. Federal Telecommunications Standards Committee (FTSC) Report. Mr. Ring, Alternate DOD Representative to the FTSC, briefed this item to the Panel. He noted that the FTSC was established in 1972 by presidential order (Executive Order (EO) 12472) and that action lead to the establishment of the Manager of the National Communications System (NCS). The FTSC's mission is to resolve interoperability problems among NCS members. While Federal Standards (FED STD) for telecommunications are technically approved by the Department of Commerce and printed by GSA – The FTSC is the technical body that has the responsibility to develop and coordinate the documents among the FTFC Members. The Manager, NCS, submits the standards under the authority of EO 12472 and NCS Directive 4-1. Mr. Ring concluded by reviewing the current FTFC projects and action item lists.

15. MIL-STD-188-161D Facsimile. Mr. George Constantinou, JIEO/CFS, briefed the Panel on this item. He discussed the Change Notice (CN) to MIL-STD-188-161D to replace the reference to MIL-STD-188-100. It will make a multipage requirement and add an optional Appendix "C" for an efficient mode. The efficient mode increases throughput by 40% at high rates. It uses existing handshake design, assigns a reserved bit and makes usage of fast turn around times that is at significant at higher rates. Mr. Constantinou presented a positive presentation in that he expected no comments from the SD-1 Coordination Draft and would be presenting the CN to the IXMP for approval. He

noted that this is not IAW the IXMP Management Plan, but felt that this was a necessary action because he can not seem to get the C/S/A to provide members for his WG. Mr. Constantinou brought up a potential problem with MIL-STD-188-148A and the Army's implementation of –188-148A. The Chairman asked the Army to investigate the problem and report back to the next IXMP (Action Item 8-3).

16. Communications Networks Subcommittee (CNSC) AC/322(SC/6). Mr. Pilla, US Del to the CNSC briefed this item to the Panel. He summarized of the last CNSC meeting for the Panel. Mr. Pilla thought it necessary to discuss NATO SATCOM 2000 at this meeting, because HF has been discussed extensively today. And he thought that even though it is the responsibility of the SISC, vice the IXMP, this Panel needs to be brought up to date on this SATCOM issue. The NATO satellite communication system is projected to reach the end of its life around 2002. To replace the existing system they have produced a market survey to see which nations are interested in developing a bid to replace the existing system. The US has responded with a proposal that we would allow them to lease space on our SATCOM 2000 system rather than build their own.

Also there is a proposal to update the Core Network with an up-to-date communications switch. There will be two (2) switches in the US; one at Norfolk, VA and the other at the Pentagon. The reason they are both in the US is that it would be cheaper to operate. NATO has already put out a contract that specified three (3) levels of precedence and preemption. The US tactical systems have five (5) levels. The question for NATO is, do they want three levels or five levels?

17. NATO C3 Board Information Systems Subcommittee (ISSC) ACC/322(SC/5). Mr. Nelson Alverez, JIEO/CFS, briefed the IXMP on this item. He stated that STANAG 4406, Version 3, the Militarized Message Handling System (MMHS), after 6 or 7 years of development, was going out for ratification around 26 Mar 99. The ratification of this STANAG will allow some degree of interoperability between nations.

The Message Secure Demonstrator Program is an SC3A initiative that asks the nations to bring their MMHS implementations to the Netherlands for interoperability testing. This is a two (2) part test. First is the

exchange of messages without security and the second part is with security.

18. NATO Tactical Communications (TACOMS) Post 2000. Mr. Michael Fragale, JIEO/CFS, US Del to NATO TACOMS Post 2000 WG, presented this item to the IXMP. He gave the background of the program that started in 1986. It is organized under the NATO C3 Board with 12 countries participating. The system architecture is going to consist of a wide area network, a local area network and a mobile system. There is a Program Office set up in Paris. The US was supposed to provide a Project Manager last year but we never filled the position. It should be filled in the next two (2) months. The objective of this Program is to produce the Post 2000 STANAGS. The results of this would be that each country will develop their own system and that will result with there being no gateways in the systems. The nations are adopting commercial standards and are using them as the basis for the STANAGs. This could be a difficult task since commercial standards quite often go in different directions.

The Project Office is going to manage a contract. The Project Office will need to work with the IXMP and the Joint Tactical Switched Systems CCB (JTSSCCB) to keep the focus toward supporting US requirements. Also the Warfighter Information Network is ahead of the current designs and needs to be incorporated into the TACOMS Post 2000 design.

There was a discussion asking why the Army has not supplied the PM, why they have not taken an active role in the development effort and why it has taken such a negative position toward the project. However, no answers were provided.

Mr. Fragale also pointed out that this is a project for and by NATO nations, but is not a NATO project. That is why it is based in Paris and not Brussels. However, the project is open to any NATO nation. He went on to say that this is a five and one-half (5 1/2) year project to write a series of STANAGs.

19. Interoperability Support Tools Working Group (ISTWG) LtCol Stuart Brock, USMC, DISA/JITC, Chairman of the ISTWG, briefed the IXMP members on this item. He discussed the ISTWG stating that their mission is to gather requirements

for interoperability support tools, get those tools developed and to the users. The group started because of differences among the UK, Germany and the US. There were three (3) were different databases being offered to NATO. Which one did NATO fund? Which one does NATO advance? The ISTWG mission is to support whichever data base is chosen, encourage the population of the data base, collect the requirements for future interoperability support tools and to seek convergence of existing and future interoperability data bases.

LtCol Brock stated that the short-term convergence goal is to share information among the existing databases and eventually separating the applications databases and refines user requirements from the existing applications. The longer-term goal is to look for opportunities to consolidate requirements

He showed a chart of the NATO Interoperability Framework (NIF) just to ensure that the group was aware that NATO had a structure. He also stated that there is a NATO C3 Interoperability Environment Testing Infrastructure (NIETI) that will be composed of the NATO and national testing facilities available for testing the elements of the NATO Interoperability environment. The Chairman asked if the JITC was going to support this testing. The JITC Commander responded that this is another requirement without funding. The bottom line this is not a requirement. LtCol Brock concluded that there are testing dates set this spring for conducting interface tests on the participating circuit switches, transmission data and the information systems.

20. Action Items (AIs). Action Items (AIs) assigned during this meeting were presented by Mr. Ring and concurred by the IXMP Members (Attachment C).

21. Closing Remarks. Mr. Pilla thanked everyone for their participation and wished a safe return trip to all that traveled to attend the meeting. He did not schedule the next meeting.

22. Adjournment. As there were no further items to be addressed or new business for this meeting of the IXMP, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1440 hours.

NOTE: Attachment D provides a list of materials Distributed at this meeting. Copies can be requested from the Recorder.

ATTACHMENT A

IXMP ATTENDANCE LIST
11 MAR 99

LIST OF ATTENDEES		
NAME	ORGANIZATION/ REPRESENTING	TELEPHONE NO. FACSIMILE NO./E-MAIL
Pilla, Lou	JIEO/CFS (Chairman)	(732) 427-6800 DSN: 987-6800 FAX: (732)427-6798 pillal@ftm.disa.mil
Ring, Gerry	JIEO/CFS (Secretariat)	(732)427-6800 DSN: 987-6800 FAX: (732) 427-6798 ringg@ftm.disa.mil
Brien, Bud	VGS/JIEO (Recorder)	(732) 953-9400 DSN: N/A FAX: (732)953-9489 bud.brien@galaxyscientific.com
Karty, Steve	NCS/DISA	(703) 607-6188 DSN: 327-6188 FAX: (703)607-4830 kartys@ncr.disa.mil
Constantinou, George	JIEO/CFS	(732) 427-6874 DSN: 987-6874 FAX: (732)427-6862 constang@ftm.disa.mil
Elvy, Steve	Harris Radio/ HFIA	 DSN: FAX: sje@rfc.com.harris.com
Fang, Paul	JS	(703)695-6276 DSN: 225-6276 FAX: (703)695-6610 fangpc@js.pentagon.mil
A-1		

LIST OF ATTENDEES		
NAME	ORGANIZATION/ REPRESENTING	TELEPHONE NO. FACSIMILE NO./E-MAIL
Herrick, Raymond	USA/CECOM	DSN: FAX: herrick@mail1.monmouth.army.mil
McDowell, Elmer	IECA, Inc/NSA	(703)288-3240 DSN: N/A FAX: (703)288-3247 mcdowelle@ieca.com
McKinnon, Rex	USAF/AFCA	(618) 256-2975 DSN: 576-2975 FAX: (618)256-2190 rex.mckinnon@scott.af.mil
Noud, Doug	USAF/AFCA	(618)256-2975 DSN: 576-2975 FAX: (618)256-2190 noud@scott.af.mil
Carmichael, William	Rockwell	(319)295-1551 DSN: N/A FAX: (310)295-5928 wrcarmic@collins.rockwell.com
Redding, Chris	NTIA	(303)497-3104 DSN: N/A FAX: (303)497-6982 credding@its.bldrdoc.gov
McGlade, Desmond, Maj	USMC	(703)784-6190 DSN: 278-6190 FAX: (703)784-2532 mcgladedp@quantico.usmc.mil
Farrell, Joseph	USN	(703)601-1277 DSN: 329-1277 FAX: (703)601-1332 farrell.joseph@hq.navy.mil
A-2		

LIST OF ATTENDEES		
NAME	ORGANIZATION/ REPRESENTING	TELEPHONE NO. FACSIMILE NO./E-MAIL
Johnson, Eric	NMSU/USA	(505)646-4739 DSN: N/A FAX: (505)646-1435 ejohnson@nmsu.edu
Scott, William	JIEO/CFS	(732)427-6851 DSN: 987-6851 FAX: (732)427-6798 scottb@ftm.disa.mil
Beam, Brad C.	USAF/SMALC	(405)734-2308 DSN: 884-2308 FAX: (405)734-2338 bbeam@hfglobal.tinker.af.mil
Ramlakhan, Chand	USA/CECOM	(732)427-5634 DSN: 987-5634 FAX: ramlakha@mail4.monmouth.army.mil
Antisell, Doug	USA/PM TRCS	(732)427-3027 DSN: 987-3027 FAX: (732)427-3061 antisell@doim6.monmouth.army.mil
Smith, Conroy	CECOM/ARINC	(732)542-8080x223 DSN: FAX: csmith@arinc.com
Fragale, Micheal	JIEO/CFS	(732)427-6882 DSN: 987-6882 FAX: (732)389-8333 fragalem@ftm.disa.mil
Brock, Stuart, LtCol, USMC	DISA/JITC	 DSN: FAX: brockls@fhu.disa.mil

0800 CONVENE - Chairperson

0815 INTRODUCTIONS
- A. Opening Remarks - Chairperson
- B. Administrative Remarks - Secretariat/Security Ofc
- C. Introduction of Attendees - All

0830 ADMINISTRATION ANNOUNCEMENTS
- A. Approval of Proposed Agenda - Secretariat
- B. Approval of Last Meeting Minutes - Secretariat
- C. Other Business - All

0900 STANDARDS ACTIVITY
- A. Defense Standardization Program (DSP) – Mr. A. Certo, DSP Program Office
- B. Military Standards
  1. CNR Working Group (WG) Informational/Status Report (MIL-STD-188-220A) – Mr. C. Smith, ARINC, for WG Chair, Mr. E. Robinson, USACECOM
  2. MIL-STD-188-241 WG Informational/Status Report (AI 7-3) – WG Chair, Mr. D. Antisell, USACECOM

1030 BREAK

1045
  3. Security WG Informational/Status Report – Mr. E. McDowell, IECA, for WG Chair, Mr. P. Wisniewski, NSA
  4. Status of Update Actions to HF Standards (MIL-STD-187-721C and –188-141B) - Army Representative
  5. MELP WG Informational/Status Report – Mr. J Collura, NSA, for WG Chair, Ms. L. Supplee, NSA

1200 LUNCH

1330 A. Military Standards (Cont)
  6. MIL-STD-188-110A WG Informational/Status Report – WG Chair, Mr. G. Noud, USAF
  7. Project Initiation Form (PIF) Review, Evaluation & Approval - Secretariat
  8. Review of Progress Reports (PRs) - C/S/A Reps
  9. Other Business - All

1430 B. Federal Standards
1. Federal Telecommunications Standards Committee (FTSC) Informational/Status Report – Secretariat for DOD FTSC Delegate, Dr. J. Davies, JIEO/CFS
2. Other Business - All

1500 ALLIED TELECOMMUNICATIONS STANDARDS
A. CNSC Informational/Status Report – US Del, Mr. L. Pilla, JIEO/CFS
B. ISSC Informational/Status Report – US Del, Mr. N. Alvarez, JIEO/CFS
C. Status Report on NATO TACOM 2000 – Mr. M. Fragale, JIEO/CFS

1530 BREAK

1545 D. USEUCOM Combined Interoperability Testing – Lt Col S. Brock, USMC, JITC
E. STANAG 5066 and Interoperability Between US/NATO HF Standards - Dr. A. Gillespie, UK DERA
F. Other Business - All

1615 OPEN ACTION ITEMS (AIs)
A. Distribution of IXMP Mgt Plan revision (AI 7-2) - Secretariat
B. Review and comment on HFIA test concept (AI 4-7) –
US HFIA Rep
C. Proposal from HFIA on Required US action on HF Activities (AI 5-6) - US HFIA Rep
E. Other Business - All

1645 OTHER BUSINESS – All

1650 ACTION ITEM (AI) REVIEW - Secretariat

1655 MEETING SCHEDULE/CLOSING REMARKS - Chairperson

1700 ADJORN - Chairperson

ATTACHMENT C

ACTION ITEM LIST
8th IXMP
11 MAR 99

ACTION ITEM 8-1:	Establish a joint Working Group (WG) to review, comment and resolve any differences on MIL-STD-188-241 (Draft) prior to the SD-1 coordination.
RESPONSIBILITY:	Chairman of MIL-STD-188-241 WG (Mr. D. Anitsell, USACECOM/PM TRACS)
DUE DATE:	Status report will be due at 9th IXMP meeting
SUBSEQUENT ACTION:	Will be placed on the agenda of the next IXMP meeting.
STATUS:	Open
ACTION ITEM 8-2:	Take the necessary action to add MIL-STD-188-141B and –187-721C to the JTA
RESPONSIBILITY:	Army Member
DUE DATE:	Status report will be due at 9th IXMP meeting
SUBSEQUENT ACTION:	Will be placed on the agenda of the next IXMP meeting.
STATUS:	Open
ACTION ITEM 8-3:	Investigate whether the Army is procuring to MIL-STD-188-148 Enhanced and if it is compatible with MIL-STD-188-148A.
RESPONSIBILITY:	Army Member
DUE DATE:	Status report will be due at 9th IXMP meeting
SUBSEQUENT ACTION:	Will be placed on the agenda of the next IXMP meeting.
STATUS:	Open

ATTACHMENT D

LIST OF HANDOUTS
8th IXMP
11 Mar 99

1. Ring, Gerald, Proposed Agenda 8th IXMP Meeting
   (IXMP-399-01)
   SUMMARY: Meeting agenda.

2. Certo, Andrew, Defense Standardization Program Report
   (IXMP-399-02)
   Summary: Status report on the Defense Standardization Program.

3. Ring, Gerald, Action Items
   (IXMP-399-03)
   Summary: List of Action Items (AIs) from this meeting.

4. Smith, Conroy, Combat Net Radio (CNR) WG Report
   (IXMP-399-04)
   Summary: An overview of CNR WG activities over the last year.

5. Antisell, Doug, Status report on the MIL-STD-188-241 WG
   (IXMP-399-05)
   Summary: Progress report on MIL-STD-188-241 WG.

6. McDowell, Elmer, Security WG
   (IXMP-399-06)
   Summary: Status of Security WG activities.

7. Johnson, Dr Eric, MIL-STD-188-141B Appendix C
   (IXMP-399-07)
   Summary: Report on the HF ALE.

8. Collura, John, MELP Speech Technology
   (IXMP-399-08)
   Summary: A report on An Enabling Technology Suite for Seamless Interoperability on Narrow Band Systems.

9. Noud, Gregg, MIL-STD-188-110B
   (IXMP-399-09)
   Summary: Status of MIL-STD-188-110B WG activities.

ATTACHMENT D (cont)

LIST OF HANDOUTS (cont)
8th IXMP
11 Mar 99

10. Gillespie, Dr Andrew, STANAG 5066 Report
(IXMP-399-10)
Summary: A report on STANAG 5066 (HF Data Link Protocol).

11. Ring, Gerald, Federal Telecommunications Standards Committee
(IXMP-399-11)
Summary: A status report on FTSC activities.

12. Ring, Gerald, IXMP Projects List
(IXMP-399-12)
Summary: A current list of standards managed by the IXMP.

13. Constantinou, George, MIL-STD-188-161D Facsimile
(IXMP-399-13)
Summary: Status of MIL-STD-188-161D.

14. Pilla, Louis, Communications Networks Subcommittee (CNSC)
AC/322(SC/6) Report
(IXMP-399-14)
Summary: A report outlining CNSC activities.

15. Alverez, Nelson, NATO C3 Board Information Systems Subcommittee ACC/322(SC/5)
(IXMP-399-15)
Summary: Status on activities of the ISSC.

16. Fragale, Michael, NATO TACOMS Post 2000
(IXMP-399-16)
Summary: Status report on current activities of this NATO group.

17. Brock, LtCol Stuart, USMC, Interoperability Support Tools Working Group (ISTWG)
(IXMP-399-17)
Summary: Report on current activities this NATO WG.